REMARKS

1. Summary of the Rejections in the Office Action of July 15, 2003

At page 2, paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the Abstract. At page 2, paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,199,079 B1 to Gupta et al. ("Gupta"). At page 5, paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Gupta.

2. Objections to the Abstract

At page 2, paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the Abstract as allegedly being written in an improper format.

By way of this paper, the Applicant amends the Abstract to place the same in proper format. Accordingly, it is earnestly requested that the Examiner withdraw his objection an/or treat the same as satisfied.

3. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

At page 2, paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, and 16 as allegedly being anticipated by Gupta, and at page 5, paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner also rejects claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Gupta.

The Applicant respectfully TRAVERSES the Examiner's anticipation rejections and asserts the following remarks in response:

"A claim is anticipated if and only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP §2131. The Applicant maintains that the Examiner fails to establish that each and every element of claims 1-4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, and 20 is expressly or inherently described in Gupta.

a. **Independent Claim 1**

The Applicants' independent claim 1 includes the limitation of "an application specific field-to-schema mapping facility configured to map said at least one field to an application specific schema for said at least one field when said application-specific schema is stored within said application specific field-to-schema mapping facility, and a generic field-to-schema mapping facility <u>configured to map said at least one field to a generic schema for said at least one field</u> when said application-specific schema is <u>not stored</u> within said application specific field-to-schema mapping facility and said generic schema <u>is stored</u> within said generic field-to-schema mapping facility." (Emphasis added.) As such, in Applicant's claim 1, when an application specific schema for a field is stored within a mapping facility, the field may be mapped to the application specific schema. However, when the application specific schema is not stored within a mapping facility, but a generic schema for the field is stored within a mapping facility, the field may be mapped to the generic schema.

At page 4, paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Gupta's system may include an application specific schema for the field to be filled in, and when Gupta's system does not include such an application specific schema, Gupta's

system may include a generic schema for the field to be filled in. Specifically, at page 4, paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that with respect to a generic schema, "the same user meta data can be specified in different ways by different forms to fill in a wide variety of forms by using the concatenation technique, which shows that this technique is a generic schema, which can apply one rule to different forms." (Emphasis added.) However, the Applicant maintains that the Examiner fails to show that Gupta describes a system in which the field may be mapped to a generic schema, as set forth in independent claim 1, because **the "concatenation technique" described in Gupta relates to mapping a schema to a value, and is unrelated to mapping a field to a generic schema**. (Emphasis added.)

Gupta describes that "an automated filling component 110 interacts with a User Meta-database 170 and a User Selection database 180 in order to perform the filling in of online forms presented by various shopping sites." Gupta, Column 6, Lines 19-22. "Fig. 1D depicts a plurality of relationships [60-90] between data objects in the User Meta-database 170." Id. at Lines 28 and 29. In particular, "[r]elationship 60 associates a form finding criterion, here a form URL 64, with a form identifier, here a form name 62." Id. at Lines 29-31. "Relationship 70 associates a pattern for matching 74 with a form name 72." Id. at Lines 31 and 32. "Relationship 80 associates a form name 82 with a property name 86, and attribute name 84, and transform function 88." Id. at Lines 33 and 34. "Attribute 84 is field in a form which we would like to fill in automatically, for example, a space for the user's name." Id. at Lines 35 and 36. "Property 86 is a piece of user meta data stored in User Meta-database 170, for example, a name of the user." Id. at Lines 37 and 38. "Transformation function 88 converts a property into a value for filling

in a field on a form." Id. at Lines 38-40 (emphasis added.) "For example, consider a

form that has an attribute called 'name' which is of a type 'last name, first name." Id. at

Lines 40-42. "Further, consider user meta data that is unique to each user comprising a

first property, 'first name,' and a second property, 'last name." Id. at Lines 42-44. "A

value to fill into the form for the 'name' attribute is obtained by concatenating the

property 'last name,' followed by a 'comma,' followed by the property 'first name.'" Id.

at Lines 44-47 (emphasis added.) "The concatenation process is a transformation

function[,]" i.e., the concatenation process is used to convert a property into a value for

filling in a field on a form." Id. at Lines 47 and 48 (Emphasis added.) As such, **the**

"concatenation technique" described in Gupta clearly relates to mapping a schema

to a value, and clearly is unrelated to mapping a field to a generic schema.

(Emphasis added.) Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner

withdraw the anticipation rejection of claim 1.

b.   Independent Claim 11

The Applicants' independent claim 1 includes the steps of "mapping said

at least one field to an application specific schema when said application specific schema

is stored within a mapping facility, and mapping said at least one field to a generic

schema when said application specific schema is not stored within said mapping facility

and said generic schema is stored within said mapping facility." (Emphasis added.) As

such, in Applicant's claim 11, when an application specific schema for a field is stored

within a mapping facility, the field may be mapped to the application specific schema.

However, when the application specific schema is not stored within a mapping facility,

but a generic schema for the field is stored within a mapping facility, the field may be mapped to the generic schema.

As set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, at page 4, paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Gupta's system may include an application specific schema for the field to be filled in, and when Gupta's system does not include such an application specific schema, Gupta's system may include a generic schema for the field to be filled in. Specifically, at page 4, paragraph 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that with respect to a generic schema, "the same user meta data can be specified in different ways by different forms to fill in a wide variety of forms by <u>using the concatenation technique</u>, which shows that <u>this technique is a generic schema</u>, which can apply one rule to different forms." (Emphasis added.) However, the Applicant maintains that the Examiner fails to show that Gupta describes a system in which the field may be mapped to a generic schema, as set forth in independent claim 1, because **the "concatenation technique" described in Gupta relates to <u>mapping a schema to a value</u>, and is <u>unrelated to mapping a field to a generic schema</u>.** (Emphasis added.)

Gupta describes that "an automated filling component 110 interacts with a User Meta-database 170 and a User Selection database 180 in order to perform the filling in of online forms presented by various shopping sites." <u>Gupta</u>, Column 6, Lines 19-22. "Fig. 1D depicts a plurality of relationships [60-90] between data objects in the User Meta-database 170." <u>Id</u>. at Lines 28 and 29. In particular, "[r]elationship 80 associates a form name 82 with a property name 86, and attribute name 84, and transform function 88." <u>Id</u>. at Lines 33 and 34. "Attribute 84 is field in a form which we would like to fill in

automatically, for example, a space for the user's name." Id. at Lines 35 and 36. "Property 86 is a piece of user meta data stored in User Meta-database 170, for example, a name of the user." Id. at Lines 37 and 38. "Transformation function 88 converts a property into a value for filling in a field on a form." Id. at Lines 38-40 (emphasis added.) "For example, consider a form that has an attribute called 'name' which is of a type 'last name, first name." Id. at Lines 40-42. "Further, consider user meta data that is unique to each user comprising a first property, 'first name,' and a second property, 'last name." Id. at Lines 42-44. "A value to fill into the form for the 'name' attribute is obtained by concatenating the property 'last name,' followed by a 'comma,' followed by the property 'first name." Id. at Lines 44-47 (emphasis added.) "The concatenation process is a transformation function[,]" i.e., the concatenation process is used to convert a property into a value for filling in a field on a form." Id. at Lines 47 and 48 (Emphasis added.) As such, **the "concatenation technique" described in Gupta clearly relates to mapping a schema to a value, and clearly is unrelated to mapping a field to a generic schema**. (Emphasis added.) Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of claim 11.

c. **Dependent Claims 2-4 and 12**

Claims 2-4 and 12 depend from independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner also withdraw the anticipation rejection of claims 2-4 and 12.

d.   <u>Canceled Claims 5-10 and 13-20</u>

By way of this paper, the Applicant cancels claims 5-10 and 13-20, without prejudice to the subject matter claimed therein. Therefore, the anticipation rejection of claims 5-10 and 13-20 now is moot and needs no further response.

<u>\<THIS SPACE IS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY></u>

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that the above-titled patent application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested. If the Examiner believes that an in-person or telephonic interview with the Applicant's representatives would expedite the prosecution of the above-titled patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record. The Applicant is including herein a Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time, and a check in the amount of $950 covering the requisite large entity fee for such an extension of time. Nevertheless, in the event of any variance between the fees determined the Applicant and those determined by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, please charge any such variance to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 01-2300.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox PLLC

By: _____

Erik B. Cherdak
Registration No. 39,936

Date: 5/18/04

Arent Fox PLLC
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-8933
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

EBC/TJC:klf